gin, gray-green when fresh, darker when dry; lower surface hispidulous, pale green or pinkish. Spikes 1-3, terminal, or solitary in the upper axils, slender, glabrous, 1-3 cm. long; peduncles hispidulous, about 8 mm. long; fruits about 0.5 mm. in diameter, dark brown when dry.

TYPE: Parish of Portland, east slope of the John Crow Mountains 1.5–2.5 miles southwest of Ecclesdown, on shaded limestone cliff, elevation 1500–2500 ft., *Proctor 10473*, collected August 11, 1955 (Holotype at the Institute of Jamaica). Additional material: *Proctor 9996* and *Webster & Wilson 5148*, from the same general area.

Named for Mr. C. Bernard Lewis, Director of the Institute of Jamaica and Curator of its Museum.

This species somewhat resembles *P. barbata* of the Jamaican "Cockpit Country" and adjacent areas, but differs in its much slenderer, mostly unbranched, recurved-pendent stems, its obovate-elliptic (instead of roundish-elliptic) leaves of more delicate texture, by its glabrate upper leaf-surfaces, and by its slenderer, shorter spikes and smaller fruits.

P. lewisii also differs from P. spathophylla Dahlst. of eastern Cuba (with which it was for a time confused) in its short-recurved (instead of long-creeping) stems which are never stoloniferous, its mostly opposite (instead of alternate) leaves which are glabrate above and never retuse or retuse-cordate, in its hispidulous (instead of glabrous) peduncles, and in having slenderer spikes. The fruits of the two species cannot at present be compared because those of P. spathophylla are known only in an immature state.—GEORGE R. PROCTOR, INSTITUTE OF JAMAICA, KINGSTON, W. I.

viola eriocarpa vs. v. pensylvanica. — The two common widespread, yellow-flowered, leafy-stemmed violets in eastern North America, Viola pubescens and V. eriocarpa are readily distinguishable by several morphological characters. Their taxonomy and ecology seem to be adequately understood, but on one point of nomenclature a correction seems to be necessary, as in recent years a few sporadic attempts have been made to substitute for the well-known binomial Viola eriocarpa that has stood since 1822, another that has been supposed to antedate it, namely V. pensylvanica Michaux (1803).

As already noted, the two species of violets are clearly defined.

Plants of *Viola pubescens*, described by Aiton in 1789, are decidedly pubescent, with strongly veined thickish leaves with ovate stipules, the basal leaves usually absent at flowering time, and seeds 2.6-3 mm. long. The other species of this pair, described by Schweinitz in 1822 from North Carolina as *V. eriocar-pa*, is nearly glabrous, with thinner, less conspicuously veiny leaves, and somewhat narrower stipules, the basal leaves usually present at flowering time, and smaller seeds about 2-2.6 mm. long.

In 1941 an attempt was made (Rhodora 43: 616-617) to displace the name V. eriocarpa in favor of V. pensylvanica Michx. An argument was presented that a photograph of the original material of Michaux's V. pensylvanica shows a mixture of V. pubescens and of V. eriocarpa, the former represented by very immature plants scarcely in bloom, the latter by a plant with well-grown foliage and an old flower. The author concludes that the latter stands as the type of the Michaux name. When we turn, however, to the original description we find the statement "V [iola] tota villoso-pubescens": the conclusion seems inescapable that the plant described is V. pubescens Ait. According to Recommendation 8C (Int. Code, 1956), whenever type material of a taxon is heterogeneous, the lectotype should be so selected as to preserve current usage unless another element agrees better with the original description and (or) figure, and in Appendix IV, paragraph 4, "The original description of the taxon concerned should be the basic guide."

That part of the original material of *Viola pensylvanica* that agrees with the original description in Michaux's Flora Boreali-Americana 2:149 (1803) is designated as the lectotype, and *V. pensylvanica* is clearly a synonym of *V. pubescens.* — George NEVILLE JONES, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

THE TYPE OF SETARIA FABERII. — The majority of plant taxonomists regard Setaria faberii Herrmann as a distinct species. A noteworthy exception is H. A. Gleason. In December, 1953 he wrote to me "I frankly can not see S. faberii as a good species. To me it is just another race of S. viridis, to be recognized possibly as a variety, or a form, or what you please, but to me it is not a species." The absence of the taxon from his New Illustrated